

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, what my intent language says is that there should be no discrimination. If the NCAA rule you are talking about says...I meant, does not involve discrimination, and my intent language forbids discrimination, why are you opposed to my language that forbids discrimination?

SENATOR GOODRICH: The net effect of your amendment says...it leads us, rather, to the position that any scholarship aid that is given to a recruited scholar...to a recruited athlete, whether he has come in on an athletic scholarship or not, if he just comes in, he plays athletic football or varsity football, in other words, or varsity basketball, either one, if he receives this other aid that we are talking about, then he must be counted, and by counting him, which we have no choice but to do, then it puts us over the 95 limit, and that, in turn, puts us in violation of the NCAA. I am suggesting that it would be better for us not to put your amendment on yet, take it off, and we will work with the rules and regs, like they say, through NCAA, and then come back and do it if you want to.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, I have another question. Senator Goodrich, are you aware that that letter from Chancellor Massengale is relative to an opinion I sought from the Attorney General on LB 708 substance?

SENATOR GOODRICH: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then why did you say it as though it applies to this amendment that I am talking about in the intent language? There is no connection. The Attorney General's Opinion wasn't requested on this intent language and the letter from Massengale does not deal with this intent language. So why would you read a letter as though it applies to this?

SENATOR GOODRICH: Because they are...that establishes that the university is working on the NCAA to get the rules changed which, in turn, is what we are after right now.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Goodrich. Members of the Legislature, I have a bill, LB 708, which would change the law. It would be a substantive change in the law. Intent language in a budget bill states the intent of the Legislature but it does not amend any statute. I made it clear that I am opposed to this kind of discrimination. The fact that 26 members voted to